

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 10 is hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15 and 16 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14, 17 and 18 as being unpatentable over Popovich et al. (US 6,525,847) in view of Yasuda et al. (EP 0 540 137 A1). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Based on our amended claim 1, Applicant submits that neither Popovich nor Yasuda, either taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest,

wherein at least one of following formulae is satisfied:

$$p_i = p(1 - \frac{d}{V_D}) \text{ and}$$

$$Ep_i = V_w \cdot \frac{d}{V_D},$$

where “p” denotes a pixel pitch of the flat panel display device, p_i denotes a pixel pitch of the switching panel, V_D denotes a watching distance, “d” denotes a distance between the flat panel display device and the switching panel, Ep_i denotes a width of the valid image display region transmitting light on the switching panel during three-dimensional image display, and V_w denotes a width of a visual field,

as recited in proposed claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that Popovich teaches or suggests this feature. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Popovich discusses adjusting the size and viewing distances according to the Rayleigh two-point criteria. (*citing* col. 25, lines 35-39).

However, in contrast to the Examiner's reading of Popovich, Applicant submits that despite Popovich's suggestion of using the Rayleigh two-point discrimination criteria to determine the size of the displayed pixels, no portion of Popovich teaches or suggests any pixel pitch p_i of the switching panel or any relation thereto. Additionally, Popovich fails to teach or suggest any relationship between a width E_{p_i} of a valid image display region transmitting light on the switching panel during three-dimensional display and the distance between a flat panel display device and the switching panel. Thus, Popovich fails to teach or suggest the features of each of the formulas recited in claim 1.

While, the Examiner relies on the discussion of the Rayleigh two-point distance discrimination criteria to teach or suggest the recited features, the Examiner fails to indicate how this could somehow correspond to the features recited in claim 1. Additionally, the portion of Popovich relied on by the Examiner, is merely related to the display of a two-dimensional image when displaying a tiled image. (*See* col. 25, lines 38-59; FIG. 21.).

Thus, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, the suggested combination of Popovich and Yasuda fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable, for at least the reasons set forth above. Additionally, Applicant submits that claims 1-9, 11-14 and 17-18 are allowable, at least because of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appl. No. 10/719/019

Atty. Dkt. No. Q78117

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2007